

REMARKS

The claims remaining in the present application are Claims 1-29. Claims 1, 11 and 21 are amended herein. No new matter has been added.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C 102

Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bertram (6,418,466). The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following rational.

Applicants have reviewed the response to arguments portion of the current Office Action and have amended Independent Claims 1, 11 and 21 to more distinctly claim the subject matter the Applicants regard as the Invention. Specifically, Applicants have included the feature "wherein said dynamic user account is automatically customized dynamically based on said user policies to limit access to said resource without requiring user input." Applicants believe that Bertram fails to teach or suggest this claimed feature.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). ... "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim.

Applicants respectfully submit that Bertram fails to disclose each and every element of amended Independent Claims 1, 11 and 21 arranged as in the claims.

Specifically, Applicants do not understand Bertram to teach or suggest “wherein said dynamic user account is automatically customized dynamically based on said user policies to limit access to said resource without requiring user input,” as claimed.

Customizing by Bertram is a manual customization based on the administrators input. In opposition, embodiments of the present invention automatically customize dynamically “based on said user policies,” which is very different from an administrator populating data to customize an account.

For this rational, Applicants submit that Bertram fails to disclose each and every element of Independent Claims 1, 11 and 21 arranged as in the claims. As such, Applicants submit that Claims 1-29 are patentable over Bertram and request the rejection be removed.

## CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested. Based on the arguments and amendments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-29 overcome the rejections of record. For reasons discussed herein, Applicant respectfully requests that Claims 1-29 be considered by the Examiner. Therefore, allowance of Claims 1-29 is respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant amendment and response, the Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,  
WAGNER BLECHER LLP

Dated: 10/30/2007

  
John P. Wagner  
Reg. No. 35,398

Address: WAGNER BLECHER LLP  
123 Westridge Dr  
Watsonville, Ca  
95076

Telephone: (408) 377-0500 Voice  
(831) 722-2350 Facsimile